

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to Final Office Action dated March 22, 2006. Claims 1-61 were examined, all of which were again rejected.

In the present Office action: claims 1-15, 19-49 and 55-60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,964,867 (hereinafter “Anderson”); claims 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0010913 (hereinafter “Ronstrom”); and claims 50-54 and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ronstrom in view of “Efficient Instruction Scheduling Using Finite State Automata” (hereinafter “Bala”). Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 16, 19, 25, 26, 29, 30, 39, 45, 46, 49, 50, 55 and 59-61 for clarification and respectfully request entry of the amendments. More specifically, independent claims 1, 19, 39, 46, 55 and 59 have been amended to include a skid region, which provides for detection of an execution event prior to encountering a subsequent ambiguity creating location.

With respect to the rejection of Applicants’ independent claims 50 and 61, as being obvious in view of Ronstrom and Bala, Applicants again respectfully submit that while Ronstrom does disclose padding of code, Ronstrom does not teach or suggest the implementation of padding to facilitate determination of a particular operation associated with an execution event. Further, Bala adds nothing of relevance to Applicants’ claimed subject matter, as Bala (page 47, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, lines 6-10) is merely directed to inserting an instruction before a branch instruction and not to, for example, inserting instructions before a target of a branch instruction. Independent claims 1, 19, 39, 46, 55 and 59, while of different scope, are also allowable for at least the reason that the applied prior art, alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest a skid region, which provides for detection of an execution event prior to encountering a subsequent ambiguity creating location (e.g., a target of a control transfer or a second-type operation). Additionally, Applicants submit that claims 2-18, 20-38, 40-45, 47-49, 51-54, 56-58 and 60 are also allowable for at least the reason that they depend upon allowable claims.

In summary, claims 1-61 are in the case. All claims are believed to be allowable over the applied art of record, and a Notice of Allowance to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Nonetheless, if any issues remain that could be more efficiently handled by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the number listed below.

<b><u>CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION</u></b>	
I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being	
<input type="checkbox"/>	deposited with the US Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail and addressed as shown above.
<input type="checkbox"/>	facsimile transmitted to the US Patent and Trademark Office.
_____	_____
	Date

<b>EXPRESS MAIL LABEL:</b> _____
----------------------------------

Respectfully submitted,



Michael R. Long, Reg. No. 42,808  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
(512) 338-6324 (direct)  
(512) 338-6300 (main)  
(512) 338-6301 (fax)